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Abstract

In the educational setting, hiring transformational leaders is essential to a school’s success or failure. In this study, we examine Confucianism and country influence on structured employment interviews from both Western (United States) and Eastern cultures (Taiwan). Eastern cultures have certain values not prevalent in Western cultures that may reduce the use of transformational leadership questions in job interviews. Eastern cultures have higher levels of uncertainty avoidance, collectivism, and power distance. We examined questions asked in actual job interviews in Taiwan and the United States (N = 178). Additionally, we examined the three dimensions of interview structure including evaluation standardization, question sophistication, and questioning consistency. We found that the number of questions about transformational leadership were less common in Taiwan, with its lower selection ratios, and when question sophistication and consistency were higher. In the United States, we found that the number of questions about transformational leadership increased with selection ratio, question sophistication, and question consistency, but not in Taiwan. The results of this study have important implications to all workplace settings around the globe where it may be argued that it is advantageous to hire transformational leaders to improve any organization. However, the results of this study may have particular importance to the educational setting, in both China and the United States, and globally, where the need to attract and hire transformational leaders can be vital to a school’s success (or failure).
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1. Introduction

“The global stage of education has added to the complexity of education reform. The continuous pressure to turn around education is an obsession of policy makers” (Kirtman & Fullan, 2016). Perhaps now more than ever, the need to hire transformational leaders in the education setting is vital to improving education, especially at the school district and building levels. According to Burgess (2002), “transformational leadership is vital to school improvement..."
initiatives” (p. 20). Transformational leadership is defined as the type of leadership that is collaborative, empowering, and participatory leadership. Furthermore, transformational leadership is leadership that “moves the follower beyond satisfying self-interests to a kind of followership that works for the good of the total organization” (Burgess, 2002, p. 39). Rooke and Torbert (2011) argue that “every company needs transformational leaders-those who spearhead changes” (p. 139). In Kirtman and Fullan’s Key Competencies for Whole-System Change: Leadership (2016), the authors share seven leadership competencies that in many ways describe transformational leadership, further making the argument for, and supporting, the importance of transformational leaders in the education setting and elsewhere. There is little doubt, that through the interview process, organizations in all workplace settings are attempting to hire transformational leaders.

In this study, we compare two approaches to the study of employment interviews and transformational leadership. One perspective adopts previously-used methods of Western cultural frameworks for use in the Eastern context. In the first approach, we use an innovative method of overlapping culture constructs. In the second approach, we adopt a Chinese theory of management to the study of employment interviews and transformational leadership. In this approach, we base hypotheses on Confucian traditions (Barney & Zhang, 2009). We then compare these two approaches. A contribution of this study is that the Confucian approach seems to be better able to explain the relationships observed in this study.

Employment interviews have been shown to be one of the most effective methods for screening job applicants in Western cultures (Huffcutt & Arthur, 1994; Huffcutt & Woehr, 1999). There have been several studies that examined employment interviews in Confucian cultures. For example, in Hong Kong, when using interviews to hire auditors, subjective qualifications were shown to be the most important factor in determining who would be hired (Law & Yuen, 2011). However, the authors reported that unlike research results in the U.S., physical attractiveness, dress, and gender did not influence hiring decisions. Yet, studies in Taiwan have found that the physical attractiveness of the applicant does positively correlate with interviewer evaluations of applicants and hiring decisions (Tsai, Chen, & Chiu, 2005; Tsai, Huang, & Yu, 2010). These contradictory findings suggest that the degree to which Western research will generalize to Confucian cultures is unclear. Other scholars have called for more research that examines whether the research about job interviews that has been conducted primarily in Western cultures, will apply in other cultural settings (Adler, 1983; Chen, Chen, & Lin, 2013; Macan, 2009; Posthuma, Morgeson, & Campion, 2002).

In addition, although there is vast literature on the positive effects of transformational leadership, there is virtually no research that examines whether transformational leadership skills and abilities of job applicants can be measured at the time they are hired. Moreover, there is no research on how national culture affects the measurement of transformational leadership in employment interviews.

Transformational leadership is an evolutionary process in which leaders and workers work together to stimulate and inspire each other (Bass, 1999; Burns, 1978; Hsu & Chen, 2011). Transformational leadership has also been described as a process through which leaders inspire vision, offer charismatic appeal, provide intellectual stimulation, and give individual consideration to individual followers (Bass, 1985; Hsu & Chen, 2011). In a study conducted on ethical leadership in 2014, Fowler and Johnson reported “existing research of the ethical dimension of leadership have been predominantly focused on transformational leadership and
charismatic leadership” (2014, p. 13). However, Fowler and Johnson also noted that, in many cases, the two (transformational and charismatic leadership) are separate entities, but theoretically are somewhat similar. Essentially, transformational leadership “represents a shift from top-down, authoritarian behavior toward value-driven action grounded in continuous learning, shared decision-making, collaboration, creativity and diversity” (Burgess, 2002, p. 19).

It has been asserted that transformational leadership is universally effective across cultures (Bass, 1997, Bass & Avolio, 1993). Transformational leadership has proven to be an effective leadership style in China. In a cross-cultural study comparing China and Canada, Wang and Gagné (2013) found that transformational leadership can positively influence a subordinate’s motivation. Another study found positive effects of transformational leadership on employee creativity (Wang, Rode, Shi, Luo, & Chen, 2013). High levels of transformational leadership in China that enabled team cognitive diversity to increase level of creativity was found in yet another study (Shin, Kim, Lee, & Bian, 2012). In the U.S., in the PreK-12 educational setting, Fowler and Johnson (2014) found that ethical leadership perspectives (what many would consider a form of transformational leadership) of school district superintendents were statistically correlated student achievement in their respective school districts. In Singapore, transformational leadership was the common style among research and development managers, and transformational leadership also increased innovation, whereas transactional leadership decreased innovation (Lee, 2008). Transformational leadership was shown to be related to increasing technological innovation in Taiwan, even though other factors such as a culture of innovation and compensation incentives for innovation may also be effective (Chen, Lin, Lin, McDonough, 2012).

Other research in Confucian cultures has examined whether other variables can influence the positive relationship between transformational leadership and positive outcomes for organizations. A study in Taiwan showed that the positive effect of transformational leadership on employee performance and on helping coworkers was partially mediated by the positive mood of the employees (Tsai, Chen, & Cheng, 2009). A study in China showed that psychological empowerment mediates the positive relationship between transformational leadership and creativity (Sun, Zhang, Qi, & Chen, 2012). In China, even in crisis situations, transformational leadership has been proven to be effective in part because of the leader’s emotional control, the quality of the leader-member exchange, and the value congruence between leaders and followers (Zhang, Jia, & Gu, 2012).

Prior research has shown that applicant use of self-focused impression management tactics had a positive impact on interviewer evaluations of applicants in Taiwan (Tsai, Chen, & Chiu, 2005). In addition, transformational leadership in Confucian cultures encouraged team coordination and, thereby, helped teams to adopt a cooperative approach to conflict management (Zhang, Cao, & Tjosvold, 2011). However, this cooperative approach may sometimes encourage subordinates to remain silent even though voicing their ideas may help the organization to be more productive (Wang, Hsieh, Tsai, & Cheng, 2011). Therefore, the positive relationship between applicant use of self-focused impression management and interviewer evaluations of applicants may not hold when employers hire individuals for higher ranking positions in Chinese cultures where power distance and collectivistic cultural values are more dominant than they are in the U.S.

Moreover, while transformational leadership has been shown to be effective in China, even the proponents of transformational leadership who have claimed that it should be universally
effective, recognize that its form and function may differ across cultures (Bass, 1997). In some cultures, these differences could make it difficult to screen for and to hire individuals who have transformational leadership skills. We propose that in China, the form and function of transformational leadership take its roots from Confucian teachings (Wang, Tee, & Ahmed, 2012). In addition, tradition indicates that important personal characteristics include being modest, being submissive, and seeking lower positions (Lin, Ho, & Lin, 2013). In fact, one recent study used the following question to measure work values in Taiwan: “I am not desperate for a raise or promotion to obtain material enjoyment” (Lin, Ho, & Lin, 2013, p. 97). This could help to explain why another study found that in a matched sample of leaders of not for profit organizations, leaders in the U.S. were more likely to be expected to exhibit transformational leadership than leaders in Taiwan (Chao & Tian, 2011). In Taiwan, asking questions about transformational leadership would be seen as less expected and less likely to occur.

H1: Questions about transformational leadership skills will be asked less often in Taiwan than in the United States.

1.1 Gender of Interviewer

Several studies have shown that females tend to exhibit more transformational leadership skills than males (Bass, 1999). Therefore, they may have a greater tendency to perceive that transformational traits are important for future leaders. For that reason, we expect that when females interview potential job applicants, they will be more likely to ask transformational leadership questions than male interviewers.

H2: Questions about transformational leadership will be asked more often by female interviewers.

1.2 Validity and Selection Ratio

The validity and selection ratio of employee selection procedures interacted to jointly influence the usefulness of employee selection procedures. Validity is the degree of the relationship between a selection test score and an employee’s job performance. The more valid the test is—the higher the validity. Validity numbers typically vary from a low of .10 up to a high of about .50, and are often expressed as correlation coefficients. The more valid the test, the better it predicts of future job performance of those who are hired.

The selection ratio refers to the number of people hired divided by the number of people who apply. A lower selection ratio means that the employer has selected only a few of those who have applied. Lower selection ratios are generally better than higher selection ratios. A lower selection ratio means that a company is being more careful in vetting the people who are hired.

Table 1 illustrates how this works (See Appendix A). Along the left column is a list of different selection procedures. Next to them are plausible levels of validity for each procedure. Along the top row is the selection ratio ranging from low .10 (i.e., 1 out of 10 applicants is hired) to high .90 (9 out of 10 applicants are hired). The numbers within the table show the likelihood that each person hired using that selection procedure will actually turn out to be employees with successful job performance after they are hired. These numbers also reflect the expected percentages of persons hired who will turn out to be successful according to which hiring procedure was used.

For example, suppose that an employer is recruiting people from a pool of job candidates. The data in Table 1 (See Appendix A) assume that in the labor pool, which is the source of
applicants, 50 percent would turn out to be successful even if picked at random. Thus, 50 percent of those who are hired would turn out to be successful regardless of the selection ratio. But suppose the employer uses a valid selection procedure, like a structured interview, to decide who will be hired. Reading across the bottom row, it becomes apparent that a low selection ratio enhances the value of using structured interviews. If the employer hires 90 percent of those who apply, the percentage of applicants who turn out to be successful from using a structured interview (54 percent) is not much better than selecting them at random. However, if the employer only hires 10 percent of those who are interviewed, then the chances of the person hired turning out to be successful increase quite dramatically to 84 percent.

Several implications follow from this analysis. First, recruiting more applicants enhances the usefulness of valid selection procedures. Second, the chances of hiring someone who will be successful when using a procedure with low validity are not much better than picking people at random. Third, at high selection ratios, even a valid test does not improve the probability of making a successful hire. Fourth, at low selection ratios, even a moderately valid test can greatly improve the chances of making a successful hire. Thus, it is important that employee selection procedures be valid, but also that employers use lower selection ratios. That is, employers who use valid selection procedures and only hire a small percentage of those who apply will have a much greater chance of hiring employees who will be successful after being hired.

Organizations can be thought of as multi-layered levels of employees in the shape of a pyramid. The number of employees decreases with each higher level. As employees seek higher level leadership positions in organizations, they are competing for positions with higher levels of compensation, responsibility, and prestige. Therefore, the number of people in the pool of applicants is likely to increase at higher level positions while the number of positions decreases. However, since leadership skills are more likely to be important at higher level positions, it is also more likely that as one moves up the organizational ladder, applicants will be asked questions about their transformational leadership skills in some way, shape, or form. Thus, the selection ratio is also likely to decrease as more applicants apply for the job openings at higher levels in the pyramid, albeit fewer. Again, it might be that, as the selection ratio decreases, it is more likely that applicants will be asked about transformational leadership skills, regardless of the interviewer gender.

H3: As the selection ratio decreases, more questions about transformational leadership will be asked in selection interviews.

1.3 Interview Structure

Numerous studies have shown that structured interviews can be reliable and valid predictors of future job performance (Conway, Jako, & Goodman, 1995; Huffcutt & Arthur, 1994; Huffcutt & Woehr, 1999; McDaniel, Whetzel, Schmidt, & Maurer, 1994). The more reliable the interview, the more likely it will yield valid predictions about the future performance of job applicants (Conway, Jako, & Goodman, 1995), and the more valid the interview, the more accurate the future job performance predictions will be. Interview structure has been shown to significantly increase validity (Huffcutt & Arthur, 1994). Structuring the employment interview improves its psychometric properties, thereby making it more useful (Campion, Palmer, & Campion, 1997). Previous research has proposed three broad categories of interview structure: question consistency, evaluation standardization, and question sophistication (Chapman & Zwieg, 2005). Unfortunately, there is little or no research that has studied the impact of these
elements of structure on the measurement of transformational leadership across cultures. Yet, it is likely that in different countries, national culture differences will impact the use of such structure. Therefore, we chose to study whether these elements of interview structure differ in Taiwan and the U.S.

Despite decades of scientific peer-reviewed studies of leadership in organizations, there remains a persistent practitioner belief that leadership is an art that is often difficult to define and study (Cleary, 2004; Scarnati, 1999). Even scholars sometimes referred to aspects of transformational leadership as an art (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999). Therefore, we expect that when managers are choosing employees for leadership positions, they will be less likely to use scientifically and psychometrically sound selection procedures, such as structured interviews. For that reason, we expect that the more the interview focuses on transformational leadership, the less likely the three elements of interview structure will be used to assess job candidates.

H4a: Interview evaluation standardization will be negatively related to the frequency of questions about transformational leadership.

H4b: Interview question sophistication will be negatively related to the frequency of questions about transformational leadership.

H4c: Interview questioning consistency will be negatively related to the frequency of questions about transformational leadership.

1.4 Meta-Cultural Differences versus Confucian Influence

There is no extant research examining the influence country culture has on selection procedure validity and selection ratios. Given that combining selection procedure validity with low selection ratios can significantly improve performance, we chose to investigate the extent to which employers actually combine valid selection procedures with low selection ratios in two different countries, Taiwan and the U.S.

Valid employee selection procedures have been consistently shown to be part of the domain of High Performance Work Practices (HPWPs) in many countries around the world (Pereira & Gomes, 2012; Posthuma, Campion, Masimova, & Campion, 2013). Yet some employers still remain reluctant to use them. Prior research suggests that this reluctance may result from a variety of factors, including desire to imitate others, inertia, institutional resistance to change, political factors, threats from the environment, etc. (Johns, 1993). We suspect that, in addition to these constraints observed in other countries, Taiwan has its own unique historical cultural legacy that may impair the adoption of these potentially useful procedures.

In this study, we use two competing perspectives. The first is a meta-cultural perspective that is based primarily on culture frameworks that have been applied in many countries. The second is a Confucian perspective. The meta-cultural perspective is based on overlapping culture constructs that are found in several cultural frameworks. There are numerous theoretical frameworks that describe differences in cultures across countries (Hofstede, 2001; House et al., 2004 (GLOBE); Schwartz, 1994). Like overlapping circles in a Venn diagram, we can think of dimensions of cultures in these different frameworks as conceptually similar and overlapping. For example, collectivism is a culture construct that is found in both the Hofstede (2001) and GLOBE culture models (House et al., 2004). It is similar to and overlaps with the embeddedness construct found in the Schwartz (1994) culture framework. Previous research has reported a .66 correlation between GLOBE's measure of in-group collectivism on the society practices scale the
embeddedness scale used by Schwartz (1994). Thus even though these culture models were verified with data that were from different samples, collected using different methods, and collected at different points in time, they all point to the reliable cross-country differences in similar and overlapping culture constructs.

Using the multi-cultural perspective, we compared Taiwan to the U.S., using several overlapping culture constructs of uncertainty avoidance, power distance, and collectivism as one theoretical foundation for hypothesized differences in employment interviews. Thus, this study uses a multicultural theory-based foundation that goes beyond prior studies that relied on only one cultural framework. This is an innovative strength of this study, because it reduces the likelihood that methodological artifacts would be alternative explanations for our findings. For example, issues like the wording of survey instruments, question scaling, and sampling methods are much less likely to threaten the internal validity of this study.

Uncertainty Avoidance. Figure 1 shows the differences between Taiwan and the U.S. uncertainty avoidance. Two different measures of uncertainty avoidance are higher in Taiwan than in the U.S. (GLOBE = 4.6 percent, Hofstede = 50.0 percent). Thus, using the two different measures of culture reported by different researchers using different methods at different points in time, we see that uncertainty avoidance is higher in Taiwan than in the U.S.

Figure 1. Taiwan uncertainty avoidance culture scores compared to the U.S.

In Western cultures, it would be appropriate for job applicants to anticipate that they would be expected to use self-promotion in job interviews in order to manage the impressions of the interviewer (Posthuma, Morgeson, & Campion, 2002). This kind of self-promotion impression management would be less expected in China (Han, Peng, Zhu, 2012). In China, humbleness, moderation, and stoicism are perceived as important values for leaders (Lai, Lam, & Liu, 2010; Zhang, et al., 2012). Those who exhibit self-promotion would be viewed with suspicion and as possibly arrogant (Lai, Lam, & Liu, 2010). Therefore, even when the selection ratio decreases as the jobs are higher in the organizational hierarchy resulting in a lower selection ratio, there will not be an increase in the use of transformational leadership questions in Taiwan.
Transformational leadership inherently implies that future leaders will seek some type of change in the relationship between employees and their leaders (Dvir, Eden, Avolio, & Shamir, 2002). Since change implies an uncertain future, we expect that in Taiwan, where the national culture prefers to avoid uncertainty, fewer transformational leadership questions will be asked even for higher ranking positions where transformational leadership skills would be expected.

H5: As the selection ratio decreases, more transformational leadership questions will be asked in the U.S. but not in Taiwan.

Power Distance. Figure 2 shows differences in power distance between Taiwan and the U.S. Power distance has been consistently reported to be higher in Taiwan. Schwartz’s egalitarianism, the opposite of power distance is 7.9 percent lower in Taiwan, but Schwartz’s hierarchy is higher in Taiwan (15.5 percent). Two measures of power distance are higher in Taiwan (GLOBE = 6.1 percent, Hofstede = 45.0 percent).

![Power Distance Comparison](image)

*Figure 2.* Taiwan power distance, hierarchy, and egalitarianism culture scores compared to the U.S.

Prior research has shown that the positive influence of transformational leadership on team performance was moderated by team potency, and that teams that were more collectivistic and had higher power distance had a stronger positive relationship between transformational leadership and team potency (Schaubroeck, Lam, & Cha, 2007). This suggests that there will be a positive influence of power on the likelihood that transformational leadership questions would be asked in interviews.

Other studies of employment interviews that were conducted in Taiwan but were based primarily on theories developed in Western cultures, have shown that adding structure to employment interviews was more acceptable because they are perceived as more procedurally just (Kuo, & Chang, 2011). These questions were even more acceptable when the interviewers were analytic, when there were strong organizational interview norms, and when the interviewers had a higher need for power (Chen, Tsai, & Hu, 2008). The analytic interviewers reacted more positively to interview structure when the jobs were highly complex. Thus, based on Western theoretical perspectives, for employment interviews in Taiwan, a culture with higher acceptance
of power distance, there will be a stronger relationship between interview structure and the frequency of transformational interview questions.

H6a: The higher power distance in Taiwan will increase the use of question sophistication for interview questions about transformational leadership more so than in the U.S.

However, we also propose an alternative hypothesis that is based on Confucian principles. Prior research has noted that followers in China are not encouraged to speak up and participate in making decisions because this would be perceived as a challenge to the authority of the leader (Lin, Ho, & Lin, 2013). Moreover, transformational leadership implies change, and change could disrupt the harmony in the organization (Lin, Ho, & Lin, 2013). Thus ironically, even though transformational leadership can be effective in China, it may be difficult to hire transformational leaders using interview questions because to do so would be to ask them to speak up about themselves and their beliefs, share their own ideas, and project change for the future of the given organization/position they are interviewing for. In addition, the more sophisticated the interview question, the more likely that the questioning could be seen as challenging the potential future leader.

H6b: The Confucian principles that are dominant in Taiwan, will dissuade interviewers from asking more sophisticated transformational leadership questions.

Collectivism. Figure 3 shows that collectivism has consistently measured as higher in Taiwan than in the U.S. Hofstede’s individualism measure, which is the opposite of collectivism is 81.3 percent lower in Taiwan than in the U.S. Two measures of collectivism in GLOBE are higher in Taiwan (in-group = 31.5 percent, institutional = 9.3 percent). Schwartz’s embeddedness, which is similar to collectivism, is also higher in Taiwan (4.1 percent).

Prior research has shown that transformational leadership can be effective across cultures. Walaumbwa and Lawler (2003) studied employees in China, Kenya, and India. They found a positive relationship between employee perceptions of their leaders’ transformational leadership behavior and collectivism values. In addition, they found that the relationship between

![Figure 3. Taiwan collectivism, embeddedness, and individualism culture scores compared to the U.S.](image-url)
transformational leadership and other outcomes was positively enhanced by higher levels of collectivism.

However, research in China has shown that a subordinate’s citizenship behaviors and propensity to take charge, were not increased by transformational leadership behaviors but were increased when the leader was seen as prototypical of a team member and the team members more highly identified with their team (Li, Ciaburu, Kirkman, & Xie, 2013). This suggests a different approach to leadership that may be more effective in Taiwan. Under this approach, the leader is not seen as transforming the team, but is seen as a member of the team.

Moreover, Confucian values include a recognition of the importance of personalism and particularism (McDonald, 2012; Seah, Hsieh, & Wang, 2010). Successful leaders in China have been reported to give this kind of individualized support and consideration to followers (Bai, Li, & Xi, 2012; Huang & Snell, 2003). This emphasis is inimical to asking everyone the same questions because doing so would tend to ignore how each individual should be given individual consideration that could contribute to the harmony of the whole group. Therefore, even though asking all applicants the same questions has been found to improve interview validity in Western studies, it will be less likely to be used in China.

H7: In the U.S., question consistency will be positively related to transformational interview questions, but this will not occur in Taiwan.

2. Methods

We chose to study transformational leadership in Taiwan because prior research has shown that transformational leadership may be more common in Taiwan than in China and also Taiwanese employees may be more satisfied with their leaders’ style (Hsu & Chen, 2011). Data were collected from persons who conduct actual job interviews in Taiwan (N = 83) and the U.S. (N = 95).

Despite calls for alternative methods for measuring transformational leadership (Bass, 1999), and despite the fact that selection interviews are one of the most commonly used employee selection procedures, there is very little research that examines the measurement of transformational leadership in employment interviews. Virtually no cross-cultural research has been conducted thus far. Therefore, we chose to measure transformational leadership in pre-hire employment interviews in two countries: Taiwan and the U.S. Each question that interviewers asked that pertained to transformational leadership was coded as 1. The questions that were coded as transformational included those that asked about idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration such as values, interpersonal, growth, etc. (Bass & Avolio, 1995; Liu & DeFrank, 2013). The transformational leadership scale was the sum total of these questions, ranging from a low of 0 to a high of 16, with 16 being the maximum number of transformational leadership questions that were asked.

Dummy-coded variables were created to indicate the presence of a factor (1 = present, 0 = otherwise) for the following variables: Taiwan, service sector, retail sector, manufacturing sector, female interviewer, and questions about experience and education. In addition, dummy-coded variables recorded the presence of elements of interview structure evaluation standardization, question sophistication, and questioning consistency (1 = present, 0 = otherwise). Selection ratio was calculated by dividing the number of persons the interviewer said were interviewed by the number hired.
3. Results

Table 2 (See Appendix B) reports descriptive statistics and Pearson bivariate correlations between the study variables. The mean size of employers was measured by the number of persons employed ($M = 459$, $SD = 969$). The mean selection ratio ($M = .26$, $SD = .19$), indicating that, on average, employers were hiring approximately 1 out of every 4 people that were interviewed.

Tests of hypotheses were conducted using hierarchical linear regression. The results of this analysis are reported in Table 3 (See Appendix C). The dependent variable was the number of transformational interview questions that were being asked in interviews. Hypotheses 1 was supported. There was a significant and negative relationship between interviews being conducted in Taiwan (Model 4: $b = -.86$, $p < .01$). Thus, transformational leadership questions were asked less often in Taiwan than in the U.S. Hypothesis 2 was supported. Transformational leadership questions were asked more often when the interviewer was female versus male (Model 4: $b = .24$, $p < .01$). Hypothesis 3 was supported. As the selection ratio decreased, more transformational leadership questions were asked (Model 4: $b = -.34$, $p < .01$). Two of the three hypotheses about interview structure were supported. Hypothesis 4a was not supported. Hypothesis 4b was supported because there was a significant and negative relationship between question sophistication and transformational leadership questions (Model 4: $b = -.41$, $p < .01$). Hypothesis 4c was supported because there was a significant and negative relationship between questioning consistency (i.e., asking all applicants the same questions) and transformational leadership questions (Model 4: $b = -.34$, $p < .01$). Hypothesis 5 was supported. As the selection ratio decreased, more transformational questions were asked in the U.S., but not in Taiwan (Model 4: $b = .26$, $p < .01$). This relationship is illustrated in Figure 4.
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Tests for hypotheses 6a, 6b, and 7 tend to support the Confucian values approach more than the Western meta-cultural approach. Hypothesis 6a was not supported, but hypothesis 6b was. The relationship between the interaction term of questions being asked in Taiwan and question sophistication was positive and significant (Model 4: \( b = .38, p < .01 \)). The nature of this interaction effect is illustrated in Figure 5.

![Figure 5](image1.png)

*Figure 5.* Transformational leadership questions asked by question sophistication and country

While in the U.S., there was a relationship between question sophistication and transformational leadership questions, this relationship did not hold true in Taiwan. Similarly, there was a positive and significant relationship between the interaction of questions being asked in Taiwan and questioning consistency (Model 4: \( b = .35, p < .01 \)). The nature of this relationship is illustrated in Figure 6. Questioning consistency decreased for transformational questions asked in the U.S., but not in Taiwan.

![Figure 6](image2.png)

*Figure 6.* Transformational leadership questions asked by question consistency and country
4. Summary and Discussion

The study was focused on interviews, and more specifically, that of structured employment interviews in both Taiwan and the United States. The summary and discussion section is written through an education lens, as to how the results, and namely, transformational leadership, applies to the educational setting. Nonetheless, transformational leaders are sought across several different workplace settings, within any organization, across the globe. Thus, a generalized approach to the summary and discussion will also highlight how this study applies to all organizations, within any workplace setting, from a global perspective.

4.1 Education Setting

The extant literature continues to support the need for transformational leaders in the education setting (Burgess, 2002; Fullan & Kirtman, 2016; Rooke & Torbert, 2011). This focus on hiring transformational leaders in the education is shared globally, as well as in both Western and Eastern settings. As previously reported, employment interviews have been shown to be one of the most effective methods for screening job applicants in Western cultures (Huffcutt & Arthur, 1994; Huffcutt & Woehr, 1999). Thus, it may be argued that the interview process is the most effective way to screen and hire transformational leaders in schools. However, when a consistent interview protocol does not exist, as well as strategies to hire such individuals, it can be a difficult task. If transformational leadership is truly the heart of effective school leadership, then we must work to design effective methods and protocols for hiring such individuals.

4.2 Globally

Rooke and Torbert (2011) argue that “every company needs transformational leaders” (p. 139). However, most of the literature on transformational leadership has been predominately published in Western settings. Nevertheless, there is an emerging literature showing that transformational leadership can be effective in Eastern settings as well. To this end, much of the extant transformational leadership literature tends to focus the positive effects of transformational leadership. Furthermore, this literature both supports and encourages organizations to develop transformational leadership skills within their current workforce. Again, this can be a difficult task when there is not a consistent interview protocol and/or strategies to ensure the hiring of current or future transformational leaders. Despite the prevalence of employment interviews as the most common method for hiring employees, there is virtually no research that describes how organizations can consistently hire and attract people with, or the potential for, transformational leadership skills.

5. Conclusions and Recommendations for Future Research

In this study, we examined the differences in interviews assessing transformational leadership skills in both Taiwan and in the United States. The results suggest that questions about transformational leadership are asked less often in Taiwan. Furthermore, we determined that as the selection ratio decreases, question sophistication and question consistency increases more often. While also determining that selection ratio, question sophistication, and question consistency influenced the frequency of transformational leadership questions in the United States, whereas they did not in Taiwan.

The results of this study suggest that organizations can and do ask questions about transformational leadership of job applicants. Nevertheless, methods other than the interview
structure may be required to increase the frequency of assessment for potential or current transformational leadership skills in the Eastern settings and other related cultures.

Within the educational setting, as well as other organizational settings around the globe, including the business sector, transformational leaders are desirable (Rooke & Torbert, 2011). To this end, hiring transformational leaders can be an extremely difficult task. As previously reported, this can be especially problematic when no interview protocol exists to ensure the hiring of both current and future transformational leaders, despite employment interviews serving as the most common practice for hiring employees. Collectively, we continue to support the need to hire transformational leaders in all organizations within all workplace settings around the globe, conversely, there is little or no research on how organizations can effectively ensure they are hiring transformational leaders. To this end, we recommend future research be focused on the development (and validation) of interview protocols to determine if applicants are, or have the potential for, transformational leadership.

Finally, in this study we examined the differences between Taiwan and the United States from two perspectives. The first perspective adopted a multicultural framework based on an innovative method of overlapping cultural constructs. The second method follows a Chinese theory of management and examines the observed relationships from a Chinese theory of management perspective. The results of this study support the Chinese theory of management perspective. Therefore, we suggest that future studies should continue to pursue research on employment interviews and transformational leadership from the perspective of a Chinese theory of management. In addition, we contend that future research should include organizational and country comparisons from around the globe.
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Appendix A: Table 1

Table 1. Percentage of successful hires by selection procedure validity and selection ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>Selection Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random Selection</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unstructured Interviews</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Checks</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability Tests</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity Tests</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured Interviews</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from: Schmidt & Hunter (1998); Taylor & Russell (1939).

Appendix B: Table 2

Table 2. Descriptive statistics and bivariate correlations between variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
<th>8.</th>
<th>9.</th>
<th>10.</th>
<th>11.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Taiwan (Taiwan = 1, U.S. = 0)</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Service Sector</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Retail Sector</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Manufacturing Sector</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Government Sector</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Female Interviewer (1 = F, 0 = M)</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Employer Size (Employees)</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td>.969</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Selection Ratio (Hired/Interviewed)</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Evaluation Standardization</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Question Sophistication</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Questioning Consistency</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 178 using listwise deletion, r’s > .15 significant at p < .05 and r’s > .18 significant at p < .01, Cronbach’s α reliability for Leadership Scale = .72.
**Appendix C: Table 3**

Table 3. Hierarchical linear regression predicting frequency of questions about transformational leadership.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan (Taiwan = 1, US = 0)</td>
<td>- .18 *</td>
<td>- .20 *</td>
<td>- .20 **</td>
<td>- .86 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Sector</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Sector</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing Sector</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Sector</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Interviewer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.18 *</td>
<td>.16 *</td>
<td>.24 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Size (Employees)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection Ratio (Hired/Interviewed)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.23 **</td>
<td>-.24 **</td>
<td>-.34 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Standardization</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Sophistication</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.23 **</td>
<td>-.41 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning Consistency</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.21 **</td>
<td>-.34 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan X Female Interviewer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan X Selection Ratio</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.26 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan X Evaluation Standardization</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan X Question Sophistication</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.38 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan X Question Consistency</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.35 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>∆R²</td>
<td>ΔF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>2.66 **</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>5.64 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>3.91 **</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>7.74 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>5.29 **</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>5.41 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>5.82 **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 204. *p < .05, **p < .01. B = Standardized Beta Coefficients.